

6110203 – ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURE
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM INDUSTRY REVIEW

Sheffield, Steven A.
407-264-3444

Comments:

Lighting and ITS systems could be included.

Response: Will consider this for future revision.

Bill Sears
954-934-1115

Comments:

Since the Maintaining Agency for signals is the County, the as-builts need to be available at the semi-final inspection. We agree with withholding a disproportionate amount (30% seems steep), but would recommend attaching the field testing (spec. 611-4) to the submittal of as-builts by requiring as-builts prior to scheduling the field testing with the Maintaining Agency.

Response: These as-builts are a condition precedent to conducting inspections for either partial or final acceptance. Should not hold inspection without the as-builts. Also, will reduce withholding amount.

Jack Knowlton
JackKnowlton@wilsonmiller.com

Comments:

I would love it if this spec can get approved.

We have been fighting to get as-builts in the field on a timely basis.

Jack Knowlton

Response: That's the reason for the change. We've been seeing this problem around the state.

Rudy Garcia, P.E.
District Six Office
(305) 499-2360
rudy.garcia@dot.state.fl.us

Comments:

Does this mean that as-built drawings will no longer be a condition precedent to final acceptance as per 611-2.3?

Response: No. As-builts still condition precedent to partial or final acceptance.

Philip C Shaw
813 918 5010
pshaw@hwlochner.com

Comments:

This will create numerous problems for the field personnel. Will the 30% be distributed over the entire pay item list for signals. If ITS work is involved then it is covered by a different spec. Why not just hold final acceptance until all the requirements are met. As stated it affects the sub and does not really impact the prime. LD's affect the prime. He has a lot more control over his subs than the FDOT or the CCEI.

Response: 30% is changed to 15% and will be distributed over all of the signalization items. Final Acceptance of the signalization is held per 611-2.2 until all of the conditions of 611-4 are met.

Jay H. L. Calhoun, PE
(813) 831-8870
www.vanusinc.com

Comments:

This proposed procedure will definitely force a contractor to produce as-builts. However, withholding 30% of payment seems a little high. It could impact their ability to pay for materials or labor. Ten to 15% would seem to be more fair, while still accomplishing the FDOT's goal.

Response: Changed withholding amount to 15%.

No Name Comment

Comments:

This will cause a problem for small DBE certified firms on projects with a long duration. As-builts are turned in at the end of each project any way.

Response: Payment of the withheld amount can be released when the as-builts are provided. This is in the control of the company that performs the signal installation.

Peggy Hansen
Pahconst@aol.com

Comments:

In response to the above referenced proposed specification change, please note that traffic signal contractors do not have 30% markups in their jobs and should not be required to finance the departments projects.

We have installed jobs in various areas of the state and have completed whole intersections which were put into complete operation, but could not complete the balance of the traffic signal work due to phasing or other issues on the job. A specific project this occurred on was FIN Proj No. 238424-1-52-01 in Lake County. We installed one strain pole intersection which operated for more than a year before the project was completed and final as-builts could be prepared and submitted. If the proposed specification had been in effect at the time this job was bid and installed, we would have had more money going out for labor, material, equipment and overhead than we could have collected if only 70% of the pay items for the installed traffic signals were paid as proposed.

The proposed specification change will put an undue burden on the traffic signal contractors, especially the small traffic signal contractors.

Response: Withholding amount has been changed to 15%. Should be able to get these provided by the time of inspection for partial or final inspection.

Fred H. Heery, Sr., P.E.
850-410-5416

Comments:

30% retainage seems a lot for this item. When I was in construction, 5 to 10% retainage was common on a job.

30% seems (is) excessive. It will likely drive up costs when construction costs are already soaring. The longer contractor's have to wait for payment on completed work, i.e., they have to finance our projects, we pay in the end.

Either reduce the retainage or come up with another avenue to suffice (e.g., bond) the issue.

Response: Withholding amount has been changed to 15%.

Gene Syfrett
D-3 Traffic Ops.
850-415-9669

Comments:

I TOTALLY disagree with this spec. change for more than one reason. On most contracts the signal contractors is a subcontractor to the contract. The sub will be held hostage to and for all LDs. As-builts are already required in the Specs all we (FDOT Project Administrators/CEI) needs to do is enforce the spec not amend it. Final Estimates in Construction doesn't like this change either.

Response: Correct that the specifications require as-builts to be submitted as a condition precedent to partial or final acceptance. This is unchanged. Subcontractor can avoid the "hostage" situation by providing the as-builts. As a point of clarification, this proposed change was developed by Construction Final Estimates.

Jim Rosa
FDOT, Construction Liaison
813-975-6269

Comments:

D-7 requires that the as-built's be given to us before the 48Hr Test can start.

Response: That is the way it is supposed to work per 611-2.3.

Ron Capobianco, Jr.
(954) 868-0023

Comments:

I submit as-buits to BCTED & FDOT seven day prior to inspection date! Per our Signalization procedures written by Broward Operation center & BCTED!

After reading this, I disagree with these changes there proposing! Especially when you have a CEI handling the oversight on state projects(premium cost involved). In D4 you have only 20 days after all pay-items are paid in site manager & all inspections have been completed (signalization) to send in your final estimate package with the acceptance letters from your maintaining agency's! Holding 30% would be impossible !!

Response: Glad that you are successful in getting the as-builts prior to inspection – that appears to be the exception. Withholding amount has been changed to 15%. The 20 day requirement is standard for all districts.

Ken Zinck
386-740-3471

Comments:

Mike Ruland, P.E. Comments 386-943-5761:

70 %/30% seems a bit much – that can be a lot of money for a small signal sub and as-built can't be completed until the job's done. What about holding 10% instead of 30% and make as follows.

611-2.3.3 Compensation: All costs involved with providing as-built plans are incidental to the other items of work associated with traffic signals. Payment for the work associated with traffic signals will be made at 90 70% of the unit price bid for signal installation.

The remaining 10 30% of the unit price will be made after submittal and acceptance of the As-Built Plans.

Tonii Brush's 386-943-5348 Comments:

6110203 Acceptance Procedure – Agree with change in spec; but with this requirement of only paying 70% of the signalization items before the contractor's as-built plans are submitted, it seems that this would be a good time to have the signalizations items lumped together as a lump sum pay item for the exception of conduit pay items. This would make it easier for the project administrator to apply the 70% pay. Most of the time there is no change between original and final quantity for these items and grouping them together to create a lump sum signalization item should not be a problem for the designer, contractor, or construction personnel.

John Burnett's Comments 352-326-7739:

I would say that Tonii makes a good point. It would be a lot of trouble to make sure you have only paid 70% on all the signal items. Lump Sum would be the way to go.

Response: Mike Ruland - Withholding amount has been changed to 15%.

Tonii Brush – I like the idea of lump sum for this work and will review past projects to see how much variation there has been between plan and final quantities to see if going to LS is viable.

John Burnett – see response to Tonii.